



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/519,245	03/06/2000	Chaitanya Kanojia	2657.2001003	8263
21005	7590 05/07/2003			_
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD P.O. BOX 9133			EXAMINER	
			CARLSON, JEFFREY D	
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
			DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		×				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•,	09/519,245	KANOJIA ET AL.				
Offic Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Jeffrey D. Carlson	3622				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cov r sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	-					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement					
Application Papers	r ciccuon requirement.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept	oted or b)⊡ objected to by the Exar	miner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)□ approved b)□ disappro	ved by the Examiner.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 						
2. Certified copies of the priority document	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-				
14)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).				
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesting 						
Attachment(s)	HLI.					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3622

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the paper(s) filed 1/28/2003.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 9 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 9 line 1, --a-- should be inserted after "in response to" for clarity.

Claim 10 page 37 line 1, "from" should be replaced by --to-- for clarity.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosser (US6446261) in view of Khoo et al (US6434747). Rosser teaches methods of inserted downloaded advertisement material into a user's TV programming. The user's set top box monitors the users viewing behavior in order to develop a user profile. Ads are associated with required viewer profiles (group profiles) so as to target the ads to the appropriate users. Rosser stores the profiles locally. Khoo et al also teaches delivery of content over a data network and subsequent insertion of targeted ads to a TV viewer, based on the user profile. Khoo et al teaches the storage of the ad content

Art Unit: 3622

and profile in a remote server which is provided with media transport service module acting as a bulk transfer manager and agent to access and download the content to the various users [col 6 lines 55-58]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have stored the profiles in a remote server as taught by Khoo et al. Regarding the instructions to download when and which content to download, Khoo et al teaches that the client devices are instructed to only download content which matches the user profile and customizes media list; the entire collection of available content is not sent to the user, but only a portion based on the profile/customized media list. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have downloaded only the customized content for each user, based on their profile, so that processing and resources are not burdened with downloading content that does not match the profile and will never be shown. The "when" limitation of the claim amendment can be met by instructions to download the content immediately (i.e. now).

The system of Rosser provides signaling to the set top box to insert the appropriate ad (system manager functionality). Rosser teaches activation criteria of turning on the TV, for example [col 4 lines 60-64].

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Rosser also teaches switching channels as an event for ad activation/display.

Art Unit: 3622

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1/28/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Rosser downloads all content available and not customized content bas43ed on user profile (thus leading to bandwidth problems). Khoo et al however teaches *customized* content download to the client devices based on user profiles matching; Khoo et al does not download the entire collection of available content. The "when" limitation of the claim amendment can be met by instructions to download the content immediately (i.e. now).

Applicant also argues that Khoo et al does not teach a data network. Khoo et al indeed teaches a data network for delivery of customized content (230, fig 2).

Applicant argues that problems with bandwidth and concurrent client data requests are avoided. However, such arguments are narrower than the present claim scope.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3622

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 703-308-3402. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6p, (off on alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Jeffrey D. Carlson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3622

jdc April 7, 2003